



CITY OF DUBLIN.

Land Use and
Long Range Planning
5800 Shier-Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

Phone/ TDD: 614-410-4600
Fax: 614-410-4747
Web Site: www.dublin.oh.us

DUBLIN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

AGENDA

- 1. Szuter Residence** **80 Franklin Street**
10-003ARB **Architectural Modifications**
(Approved 4 – 1)

- 2. Timeless Skin Solutions** **31 South High Street**
10-005ARB **Sign Modifications**
(Approved 5 – 0)

- 3. Physiofitness** **87 South High Street**
10-007ARB **Architectural and Site Modifications**
(Approved 5 – 0)

- 4. Architectural Review Board Rules and Regulations** **Administrative Request**
04-078ADM
(Approved 5 – 0)

William Souders called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Other Board members present were: Denise Franz King, Tom Currie, Carl Karrer, and Robert Schisler. City representatives present were: Eugenia Martin, Jennifer Rauch, and Libby Farley.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Carl Karrer made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Ms. King, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Motion and Vote

Denise Franz King made a motion, seconded by Tom Currie, to defer approval of the January 27, 2010 meeting minutes to the next meeting so that speakers on Page 4 can be clarified.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Ms. King, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Communications

Eugenia Martin highlighted the Newsletter. She pointed out that the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes for the presentations on Land Use Principle 6 and Land Use Principles 7, 9, and 10 were included since the January Architectural Review Board meeting was adjourned prior to the presentations. She said also included in the packets was the 2009 Summary Report which highlights all of the cases heard before the Board and other activities of the Board. She said the

Report will require a vote of acceptance by the Board. Ms. Martin informed the Board the ARB Zoning Code Section was approved by City Council at their February 8, 2010 meeting and will go into effect on March 10, 2010. She said Review Criteria was now included in the Code as well as the ability for Administrative Approval of minor applications such as paint color changes and window or door style changes. Ms. Martin said there will be minor changes in the Staff Reports to provide more of a connection to the now codified Review Criteria and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*. She said the Board identified updating the *Guidelines* as an Annual Item of Interest and once the item receives approval from City Council, the Board could move forward with updating the *Guidelines* for more continuity between the two documents.

Mr. Souders asked the 2009 Summary Report Chart indicate not only the number of cases approved and denied, but also the number of cases tabled or withdrawn. Ms. Martin agreed to add the information to the Summary Chart and bring it to the next meeting for review.

Mr. Currie noted a typographical error on Page 2 of the 2009 Summary Report under Looking Forward to 2010, first paragraph, last sentence, and said the word *form* should be corrected to *from*.

Ms. King said the 2009 Summary Report was very helpful. She referred to Annual Items and the sentence: *The Board had many great ideas but was able to forward a final list with three multi-faceted and mutually agreed upon topics to City Council to be reviewed...*, and asked that the three topics be included.

Motion and Vote

Robert Schisler made a motion, seconded by Carl Karrer, to accept the Architectural Review Board 2009 Summary Report with the requested amendments. The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Ms. King, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; and Mr. Schisler, yes. (Approved 5 -0.)

Mr. Currie requested a list of the 20 sites in consideration for Public Art in Public Places for the next meeting, particularly, those in the Historic District.

Mr. Souders suggested the Board identify the top three locations within the Historic District to make a recommendation for future public art so a document would exist which the Board could refer to in the future.

Mr. Currie said his concern was it appeared under the current procedures, the Dublin Arts Council could recommend to Council that artwork go on any of the 20 sites and the Boards and Commissions which would have some responsibility in that area, are bypassed. He explained if the Board could choose the top three sites in the Historic District, it could fulfill what they are appointed to do.

Mr. Karrer said there was a legitimate role for ARB in the art process, but definitely not in the area of approving the art. He agreed the Board needed to have some input in the site selection process if it is in the Historic District, and he thought they should formulate some parameters that would define what acceptable art in the District is. He said the Art in Public Places process is well defined though the aims of the program are not necessarily consistent with the aims of historic preservation in the District. He said he would like to ask City Council to provide the

Board with a forum to meet with one or more representatives of Council and discuss options they might consider for ARB to have a role in the Art in Public Places process. He said the present system does not allow commemorative art because it does not fall into the creative category the present program specifies. Mr. Karrer said the Board should also work with the City and the Dublin Arts Council to define a process which brings some commemorative art to the District. He said the Board's input should be before the selection of the artwork and should include input to the site selection for those that are not in the commemorative art category.

Ms. Martin agreed to share the comments of Mr. Karrer and Mr. Currie with Council and report back to the Board.

Mr. Souders asked if there was a Council member assigned to the Historic District. Ms. Martin said she believed that Council member Amy Salay had the ward for the Historic District, but would verify.

Mr. Souders explained the responsibilities and procedures of the Architectural Review Board. He swore in those intending to address the Board on any of the Agenda items, including the applicants, their representatives, and City representatives.

**1. Szuter Residence
10-003ARB**

**80 Franklin Street
Architectural Modifications**

Jennifer Rauch presented this application requesting replacement of the previously approved garage doors on the east elevation and the man-door on the west elevation of the new detached garage. She said Planning reviewed the proposal and found the *Guidelines* are met for this proposal and recommends approval without conditions.

The Board discussed with Mr. Szuter, the applicant, the reasoning behind changing the doors. Mr. Szuter said it was due to cost and availability. Tom Currie said the proposed doors coordinated well with the home. William Souders said he preferred the previously approved door style.

Motion and Vote

Tom Currie made a motion, seconded by Robert Schisler, to approve this Architectural Review Board application because the proposal meets the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the Zoning Code.

The vote was as follows: Ms. King, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; Mr. Souders, no; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Currie, yes. (Approved 4 – 1.)

**2. Timeless Skin Solutions
10-005ARB**

**31 South High Street
Sign Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this application requesting two signs for a business located in a carriage house in the Historic District. She said the two signs are to be located on the north and south sides of the building. Ms. Martin explained that the building has parking on both the north and south sides with a breezeway connecting them, and there are two entrances. She said according to Code and the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines*, two signs are permitted, provided

that the second sign is located at the rear parking lot. She presented graphics showing the proposed locations of the two 23.5-inch high by 34.5-inch long, one-inch thick wood signs. Ms. Martin said the text, logo, and border would be routed into the wood and painted Metallic Gold. She said the background of the signs will be painted Roycroft Bronze Green (SW 2846), a color similar to the existing sign at the adjacent carriage house as well as compliments the color of the cupola. She said the sign would be attached to the building with a 37-inch long, one-inch square metal bracket, which would hold the sign off away from the face of the building, approximately ¾-inch to provide more of an architectural reveal.

Ms. Martin said per Code, primary images are to be the name of the business, and secondary images are permitted if they do not exceed 20 percent of the maximum permitted area of the sign, or 1.2-square-feet for this application. Ms. Martin explained when the applicant applies for a Building Permit, the *Timeless Skin Solutions text*, which is the secondary image, would need to be sized appropriately.

Ms. Martin said the proposed font for *Carol L. Clinton MD*, was similar to the Caslon Italic font, and the *Timeless Skin Solutions* font is similar to the Olive Antique font. She confirmed the proposed font styles were identified in the *Guidelines* as appropriate letter styles.

Ms. Martin said Planning has analyzed this application and believes the sign coordinates well with the building and the adjacent sign, is pedestrian in scale, and recommends approval with two conditions:

- 1) The secondary image be resized to 20% of the maximum permitted area of the sign face, or 1.2 square feet for this application; and
- 2) A sign permit be obtained prior to installation.

Robert Schisler asked if the both signs would be mounted the same way on the building. He said it made more sense to have the north sign be a projecting sign instead of a wall sign. Janey Gentile, the applicant's representative, clarified both signs would be mounted the same way with the bracket described on the plan.

Mr. Schisler asked if the proposed sign met Code. Ms. Martin said the size of the wall sign did meet Code.

William Souders said he did not understand the Metallic Gold being used on the sign since the color of the building was red with white trim. Ms. Gentile said the gold color complimented the other signs in the area.

Motion and Vote

Denise Franz King made a motion, seconded by Carl Karrer, to approve this Architectural Review Board application because the proposal meets the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the requirements of the Zoning Code, with two conditions:

- 1) The secondary image be resized to 20 percent of the maximum permitted area of the sign face, or 1.2 square feet for this application; and
- 2) A sign permit be obtained prior to installation.

Ms. Gentile, representing Dr. Carol L. Clinton agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; and Ms. King, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

**3. Physiofitness
10-007ARB**

**87 South High Street
Architectural and Site Modifications**

Eugenia Martin presented this application requesting review and approval of architectural and site modifications that include relocation of the air conditioning unit, repainting the building, the addition of gutters and downspouts, and replacement of building materials. She said the applicant has replaced eight of the original single-pane, double-hung wood frame windows located on the north, south, and the front of the building with two-wide, one-high simulated divided light, double-hung wood frame windows. She said the original four-wide; five-high simulated divided window on the front of the building was replaced with a similar designed wood frame window. She said the body of the building is currently painted white with burgundy trim, and the applicant proposes to paint the body of the building Intellectual Gray (SW 7045) and the trim, Tricorn Black (SW 6258). She said the proposed paint colors are included on the Historic Palette and identified as colors used in the time period of the building. Ms. Martin said the applicant has installed half-round gutters and full round downspouts on the north, south, and rear elevations of the building, similar to those used throughout the District.

Ms. Martin said the original southernmost front door was a half-light door with single-pane glass on the upper half and a raised wood panel on the lower half, and the northernmost front door was a half-light door with a three-wide, three high, simulated divided light upper half and a recessed wood panel that is a different style than the southern door. She said the doors have been replaced with identical half-light doors with single-pane glass on the upper half and a recessed wood panel on the lower half. Ms. Martin said the applicant has replaced the rusted, original rear metal door on the rear building addition in order to meet current Building Code egress requirements. She said the new 36-inch wide wood door includes a single pane glass on the top half and a recessed wood panel on the lower half, similar to the front doors.

Ms. Martin said that the existing T-111 building material covering the rear addition was not meant to be used as a permanent siding and the applicant has been experiencing rot in addition to other damage to the building material. She said the applicant proposes to remove the T-111 siding and install brick veneer which will be painted the same color as the body of the building, Intellectual Gray.

Ms. Martin explained the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* recognizes brick or masonry used within the District, but does not recommend it be painted. She said Planning recommends a cementitious beveled siding be used, similar to the existing siding on the structure, painted the same proposed color for the body of the building, so there would be continuity in design.

Ms. Martin said the Landscape Code, states all service structures, including air conditioning units, should be screened by material having one hundred percent opacity and one foot more than the height of service structure. She said the screening material could be plant material, wall, fence, or a combination of any of them. She said, the applicant originally proposed plant material to screen the unit but the area lacked adequate space for growth of the plants. Ms.

Martin said the applicant is now proposing a lattice-style fence to screen the unit, however the design and open nature of the lattice will not meet the one hundred percent opacity requirement of the Code. She said Planning recommends the panels be altered to have more of a louvered style, similar to the shutters on the front of the building which will provide architectural continuity as well as meet the Code regarding opacity.

Ms. Martin said based upon the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* for additions and site modifications as well as architectural modifications, Planning has determined that the changes fit with the structure as well as the District, and recommends approval of this application with two conditions:

- 1) The painted brick siding on the rear of the structure be changed to a painted cementitious beveled siding to match the existing siding on the structure; and
- 2) Screening for the air conditioning unit be changed to have a similar design to the shutters on the front façade of the structure to meet required opacity screening requirements.

Mr. Souders asked if the brick will have a foundation or will it be a veneer which is thinset to the building. Shannon Hospel, co-owner and applicant, said it would be a brick veneer which is thinset to the building, but she agreed to use the cementitious product instead.

Mr. Souders pointed out the air condition unit condensers need air to circulate and he was concerned the screening might be too close. Ms. Martin explained when the applicant submits for a Certificate of Zoning Plan Approval, the screening could be inspected to ensure there is adequate distance to permit air movement.

Mr. Schisler asked if wood siding that matched the siding on the addition could be used instead of cementitious siding. Ms. Hospel said she preferred the siding look like the rest of the house and was fine with either wood or cementitious siding as long as it blended.

Mr. Souders noted the original trim over the doors was painted white and asked what parts of the building would be painted black. Ms. Hospel said everything that was red or burgundy will be painted black. She said the existing white dentil molding would be painted Intellectual Gray to match the house.

Mr. Currie confirmed the outbuilding would be painted to match the house. He asked why Planning had recommended cementitious siding. Ms. Martin said the applicant expressed a concern about water damage and durability.

Mr. Currie said the outbuilding was wood and it made sense to him to match the siding on the outbuilding or continuing the beveled type of siding. He said the porch has an old-type of wooden horizontal siding, but he was not sure it was on the front. He pointed out that above the front porch was very old plank siding that was probably walnut. He recommended choosing either one of the wood siding styles for the addition. Ms. Hospel agreed.

Carl Karrer asked if the gutters had been installed. Ms. Hospel said part of them had already been installed. She said the standing seam roof would be repaired, but not replaced.

Ms. Martin confirmed amended Condition 1, The painted brick siding on the rear of the structure be changed to painted wood siding to match the existing siding on the structure.

Ms. Martin asked if Condition 2 should be altered. Mr. Souders said it would be better if Ms. Martin, the applicant, and a mechanical contractor worked out a solution for the screening. He said the mechanics of the air conditioning unit had to work and he did not want it to just meet Code.

Mr. Currie asked about screening and the necessary egress from the building required by the Fire Code. Ms. Martin said the screening of the air conditioning unit must meet the Fire, Building and Zoning Code in a manner that will not hinder the mechanical capabilities of the unit.

Motion and Vote

William Souders made a motion, seconded by Denise Franz King, to approve this Architectural Review Board application because this proposal meets the *Historic Dublin Design Guidelines* and the requirements of the Zoning Code, with two conditions:

- 1) The painted brick siding on the rear of the structure be changed to painted wood siding to match the existing siding on the structure; and
- 2) Screening for the air conditioning unit be changed to complement the existing structure to meet Zoning Code for opacity screening requirements and applicable Building and Fire Code requirements.

Ms. Hospel agreed to the above conditions.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; Ms. King, yes; and Mr. Souders, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

4. Architectural Review Board Rules and Regulations Administrative Request 04-078ADM

Jennifer Rauch explained two minor items relating to Ex Parte contact and the amount of time given for public comment were changed by City Council for the Rules and Regulations governing the Architectural Review Board, Board of Zoning Appeals, and the Planning and Zoning Commission. She said the rest remain unchanged from the last time the Board reviewed them.

Motion and Vote

Denise King made a motion, seconded by Robert Schisler, to accept the updated Architectural Review Board Rules and Regulations as approved by City Council on January 11, 2010.

The vote was as follows: Mr. Souders, yes; Mr. Currie, yes; Mr. Karrer, yes; Mr. Schisler, yes; and Ms. King, yes. (Approved 5 – 0.)

Mr. Souders adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

| As approved by the Architectural Review Board.